Systemicism & the Peaceful Divorce from Hierarchies

Preface:

In the scope of global cultural and socio-political issues herein, it has become necessary to define a revolution or revolutionary movement by not only the merit of its ideals but also the methodology and means by which its visionaries may employ so as to ascertain the ideal world. “Idealism” within the context of this text refers not to the metaphysical perspective (*i.e. Marx, Idealism as the antithesis of Materialism*), but rather the necessity of the individual and the intellectual to envision a better world, or an *ideal* world as an antidote to the “real” world.

It is worth noting that what is, in layperson's terminology “the way things are” is not necessarily “true;” the institutions as a social construct may be “real” by the sole nature that we have ourselves willed such powers into existence by enforcement. But it comes a time that one must divorce oneself from the abridged purview of a corrupt system of powers and analyse these structures as a product of systems of oppression; to view the existence of currencies and formalized systems of trade as a means by which corporate society is enforced. The same applies to the existence of nations and nationalism and the national system; these are false idols designed to project the illusion of straightforwardness or simplicity to a convergent and absurd existence.

Similarly is the case with organized religion, see Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*: [Religion as] “Philosophical Suicide” (Camus 10). By adhering solely to organized religion, one negates the internal rumination innate to a philosophical journey of the self; or introspection, rather the substitution thereof with an established spiritual meaning rather than a philosophical one. I believe it is in the best interests of most that we see a world with no gods as not some devoid and desolate existence but rather take solace in that fact, and use it to create a meaning of our own, a meaning which may vary by individual. This way

each individual may remain free to pursue their meaning, be it borne of reason or of belief or fatih, but never dogmatic.

Though I do oppose the common Enlightenment-era sentiment of the uniform nature of the rational mind as a collective; I hardly believe that is true. I believe that rational minds will always run into disagreement and incongruence because the nature of the reasonable mind is to question authority, to question standards, and to question the status quo or dominant ideas within culture, which themselves are various and transient. Anthropologically it is reductive to assume a global monoculture wherein all rebellion must be rebellion against the global oppressive as opposed to individualised oppressive systems that are created themselves of an analogous but separately-arising root phenomenon.

Similarly to the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, I should include within the preface a statement of my own fallibility. I hold not only the capacity for incorrection as well as the certainty of inconsistency within any of my work. My ethical system, like all other ethical systems attributable to an individual, are infinitely-variable and they are conditional; this is why I would refrain from prescriptive ethics as it seems to me a caveat is inevitable at one point or another. All humans, to some extent, pick-and-choose their personal response to a presented situation. I digress, if you understand the breadth of what I have written herein (the entire textual corpus) you are smarter than I am. I myself do not intend this as a guidebook or structural body by which to build purely off of. Rather, I consider it largely tentative: to adhere entirely to Systemicism is, paradoxically, to betray it. The ideas put forth are to be considered in the context of one's own; anyone who reads on Systemicism can certainly point out something which I have missed.

To continue the writings I present are not a pure statement of a direct methodological or ideological axiom itself but rather a subtext and an abstraction of an ideal which is to be sought by those perhaps more left-brained than I. I do not claim to be speaking on pure behalf of rationale, I am

principally an emotional individual with a chemical mind, and it is by emotion and introspection that I have come to conclusions henceforth. Thus what is meant by *Idealism* within the context of the proclamation; the capacity for the mental construction and imagination of an "ideal" world devoid of oppression, of hierarchy, of violence. What I hope is that the ideal abstraction[s] put forth will bring to fruition a divorce from the constrained worldview of capitalism and the corporate and hierarchically-tribal society.

Reason in itself is inherently a double-side of the proverbial coin of empathy and ethicality. The foremost atrocities of human society have been borne neither of reason or emotion, but rather a perversion of either at the hands of some individual's desire for power, for control, for authority, and quite often in capitalism, money. That end goal is neither rational nor ethical. Such individuals seek to ascertain this power through the unaware submission and zealotry of the uneducated and the mob-mentality of an upset people who have themselves resigned to an immutable ideology and neglected their own introspection and search for meaning. This is why I intend Systemicism not as a stone-set doctrine but rather a common ideal.

Similarly, there is extant no viable means by which *motive* may be verified truthfully and without fault. Throughout history, many right-wing nationalist movements have been disguised under a false projection of leftist rhetoric. Systemicism is inherently left-wing because it is focused on the dissolution of hierarchies within society, though differs from traditional leftists movements in the sense that it is focused not on a pure collective but rather on the means of the individual actor as a member not of a collective but more so a network of interacting entities driven by some sort of systematic construct brought forth to be self-fulfilling; more akin to a sort of critical theory by means of analysis. It mustn't exist localized, and it knows, and shall never know a nation.

Systemicism Defined:

Systemicism is a working designation for a set of social, political, and philosophical ideals that I present that are primarily focused on pacifism and the ideal structure of a social revolution which I propound for consideration among left-wing, anti-authoritarian movements. It is not a hard label, nor is it or shall it be a faction or overarching prescription for a way of unified thinking. It is not an antithesis to collectivist thought of the past but rather a more post-modern movement stemming forth. In other words, in order to create true progress, we must not only dismantle the systems and arguments of the oppressors but also rigourously parse our own convictions and intellectual standpoints for vulnerabilities, loopholes, or contradictions which could work in the favor of the opposition.

Let it be known that a world free of violence is not a world devoid of melancholy, of heartache, or of rage, of indignation. The aforementioned are the paramount of a people invulnerable and unwilling to submit to an oppressive. What it is, is a world free of hatred, for hatred is the ideology of violence, and it is the intellectual manifestation of the physical existence of violence. Violence is to physicality and to interaction as hatred is to outlook and to dialogue.

One implicit conviction of Systemicism is the characterization of the nature of a revolution as not to exclusively be defined as its ideal, but to be judged according to its intellectual structure as well as its tactics and methodologies, as the latter are the outward manifestations of internal value. The extent to which violence is employed by a revolutionary movement is indicative; it is a verifier of the validity of the strength of ethical conviction within the heart and within the mind of the revolutionary. Actions are ideological as are words because they themselves are the actualization of thought materially. Historically, the revolutions which have been notably violent in nature have led to the installment of authoritarianism and oppressive institutions at their end, often representing a false and illusory perversion of its original intent. Revolutionary methodologies are indicative of the type of society that will be installed should they succeed; a violent, highly-organized movement expedites the process of change, but at the expense that

once theirs becomes the dominant thought such violence and organization will then translate to militarism and hierarchy respectively.

Similarly, this is the reason that a revolution of Systemicism would employ the gradual substitution of extant institutions of oppression with less formally-codified instances. These instances will eventually become unnecessary and wither away leaving behind a non-hierarchical state of unified individuality. This is derived to Engels (*i.e. "The state will wither away;" hardly a novel concept*) but it is distinct from classical Marxist theory in its manner of implementation. The principle of Systemicism is to avoid the absolute status of one class or individual as a de facto ruler or disciplinarian; this would involve temporarily reducing the extent of leadership into several temporary institutions ultimately bound to the will of the common interest.

Systemicism advocates for the rejection of "dominant" individuals from influence, social and political. Those who desire to dominate upon others in any way are as well intent on dominating over others' minds and autonomies as dominance is a similar outward extent of ideology as is violence. Individuals who aspire for dominance, and maintain dominance as a prerogative, and are unable to recognize the flaw of desiring explicitly control and influence over others as a means of self-fulfillment, would be in internal conflict with their own imperatives if they were not also inclined to abuse. This is because constantly leaping at power implies one's mind must exist within the purview of a society reliant on power and hierarchy, it implies that the individual has mentally "corporatized" their fellow humankind.

That stated, it is only within the abridgements of corporate worldview that makes the opposite of dominance submission. Dominance is the expression which sustains corporatized, hierarchical society; hence the true opposite of dominance is skepticism. It is the distinction of the mind; its rationale and its ethical complex, from the established hierarchies and doctrines which sustain themselves upon themselves alone. That is not to say that entire repudiation from this myopic perspective is free from any and all

dynamics of power and influence, but it must be as distant as possible from them. Henceforth I will refer to such issues as the *Axiom of Ideal*. By Axiom of Ideal I mean the necessity of establishing an ideal as to be pursued, with the knowledge that its ends is statistically intangible or inviable, but choosing to continue envisioning it and pursuing it as nonetheless it is ideal and an ultimate positive is to be obtained from the steps by which it is obtained, under the condition that its means are reflective of its ideal.

"Gendered Society:"

By "Gendered Society" I mean not a reference of gender as an identity in the literal sense but instead a more proverbial and novel usage of the term; in reference to the aforementioned, I mean more specifically the traits expressed societally that are representative of their associated social pole. My belief is that overall society is, and has always been far too ideologically "masculine." What I see is masculinity as an ideology, and I believe that it is neglected far too often that it is a set of identifiable traits, actions, and behaviors that constitute not only an attribute but an ideology, or at the very least a system of influence. While its manifest is often largely covert, it is cult-like in nature and in means.

Because of this I would consider myself opposed to the imposition of masculinity as a construct upon generations forthcoming, as traits associated with masculinity, the consistent intention to impose oneself over and upon others, competitiveness out of its own sake, and the suppression of the emotional and the ideal world are not only harmful to collective harmony and surrounding individuals; they are as well self-destructive and self-defeating. The supposed "positives" of masculinity bring about triumph, but where? Triumph in war? In nationalism? Triumph over others? Yes, the supposed "positives" of the masculine archetype are only triumphant in the sense that they must leave someone else, or a greater collective of "else" to be triumphed over. In this case the positive is defined only as a positive by those whom it affects positively. Where in that lies ethicality?

A Post-Binary Approach to Revolution

Systemicism views revolution through the lens of psychology as its principle tactic. Those who wish violent revolution are unaware that the installation of the revolution will inevitably devolve into a hierarchical and fundamentally right-wing establishment upon its overthrow of the existing establishment. This is because violence is rightism in nature; to establish that a result be driven by dominance, by physical power. Such is not a statement that the ends does not justify the means, rather, it is a statement that the ideological validity of the ends in itself are subject to the nature of means.

Systemicism in nature advocates for a society which is more sensitive to the emotional realities; for what else shall be the orient of leftism if not an optimization of the emotional condition of the masses? Yes, contemporary leftism is based primarily in materialism and the betterment of material condition, but why? Because material condition is an egress to emotional actualization. I should preposition this in the lens of Maslow's hierarchy of needs; it is upon a basis in material by which self-actualization is to be achieved. The right-wing foolishly views Maslow's hierarchy of needs as beginning at a set level for each and viable to be achieved by one's will alone, whilst the left acknowledges that this hierarchy is adjusted in favor of those who have historically and societally benefited from systems of oppression.

Because self-actualization is viable for the privileged alone, the privileged alone will believe that self-actualization is universally-viable. The reason that leftists advocate for the dismantling of hierarchies and universal attainment of basic needs is not solely because of man's desire for basic needs alone but more so because the fulfillment of Maslow's lower levels allows for the expansion of the mental foci into the realms of self-actualization and Maslow's higher levels. This is not to be forgotten amongst the left. I thus believe that the interior psychological reasoning for any leftist revolution is emotional as opposed to material. While it is true that human emotion is archetypal, it can generally be understood that at the root of any psyche is something which must be understood as a desire for the attainment of the actualization of the self and psyche, which is intellect, and intellect as a product of emotion's desire for fulfillment.

The Evil of Righteousness

It should go without further clarification that military conscription is an affront to the self; it is a prescriptive, exogenous impediment upon the livelihood of a people and a person, and thus conscription is never to be employed by a state that should be considered worthy of legitimacy. One's fate shall never be left to the irresponsible and corrupted hands of hierarchical authority. Such, it is not within the rights of the institution, should it exist, to play with death. As death is inconceivable, and unimaginable, only a fool wields the last resort of nature and claims it his own.

Similarly, however, it seems understated in most traditional criticisms of militarism the effect and extent to which psychology is force. Because it is clear that the psyche is composed of a convergent sum of proverbial "true-false" logical switches, so to speak, it is generally clear that the neurotypic mind responds to stimuli in a manner which is predictable and capable of being generally understood by a set of observable behaviors and responses. This is known among the military propagandists and it is employed; no natural mind feels responsibility to a nation as no natural mind sees a nation as but a division. And likewise, no natural mind feels willing to kill or to die in the name of division. Such a conviction can only result from psychological manipulation. And this manipulation by consequence is violence in ideological form.

Probably the most terrifying instrument of this in historical society is the usage and perversion of organized religion. Prior to the inception of modern militarized capitalism the primary instrument of violent control was found within organized religion. The promise of an afterlife which is presumably superior to life on Earth has created people who are willing to risk their life, or jeopardize the lives of others, in the name of some ulterior motive that truly does not serve them but rather serves the interests of those in power, the oppressors, who have bestowed upon the population a mass means of philosophical and spiritual surrender, and have come to view life on Earth as being of sole material and a true metaphysical peace lies beyond life. This has been the greatest charlatanism in the history of man.

Death is to be defined as the cessation of the consciousness, and the autonomy of the psyche. This is not an attack on metaphysics or philosophical idealism; rather, it is an attack on the impediment of the ideal self at the means of dogmatism, and the negative of the endogenous search for meaning and identity that is intrinsic to the unbound mind. Search for meaning is tacit and necessary in human nature, but it is negated by the institution of organized theology. For this reason, I advocate for the gradual phase-out of traditional religion. The reason for which I do not ascribe myself to a religion is borne of logic, yes, however the reason for which I directly oppose religion is borne of ethics, and of humanity, and the human nature.